Scott. H.27—45,000—15-11-35.

Revenue (1936) Department.

MS SERIES.

G.O. No. 1887

DATED 26-8-36

[Despatch Abstract.]

t - Forests - (South Kanara) - Unreserved lands - Cutting of leaf manure - formation of panchayats - Suggestion - Not pursued.

Rev-Defd

HM. Rc 389 F 86. (D) 3.2.86

Assignment - Land - (South Kanara) - Leaf manure

p 388 F

I Lr 6-4-86.

ER 4-5-86
RKhlem 20.5.86
RKdm 12.5.86

ER 4-6-86
RKhlem 9.6.86
RKdm 11.6.86

ER 3-7-86
RKhlem 9.7.86
RKdm 10.7.86

It has been brought to the notice of the Govt that there are large extents of unreserved land adjoining the reserved forests in the South Kanara District & that it is only the people who would take care to obtain grants of these lands on patta & grow their own trees in their forests & there would not be any demand for leaf or firewood from the reserved forests. It has therefore been suggested that each village should form a panchayat & take the necessary land on patta as a village common & grow trees in their forest there for the use of the whole village. & that at the end of five years by which time the forest growth should be sufficiently established for all practical

purposes the present concessions regarding grant of leaf-manure & firewood from reserve forests should be withdrawn; wherever enough land has been granted to the Orangest is obtainable. The Bd offer. is requested to offer its remarks on the suggestion.

To

The Bd officer.

31.1.36

1.2.36

Dpd.

Dpr. 8 i. 36

Date

C.F. 31—13,206—14-12-35.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT No. 2962-F

Received ____ 19 *Registered* 15.7.36 19

Subject.

Forests - (South Kanara) - unreserved lands - Cutting of leaf manure - Formation of panchayats - Report - submitted.

Ref. L. No. 212/36-1

Station Madras. , *Dated the* 10 - 7 19 36

From

T.N.S. Raghavan Esq., I.C.S.,

ADDL. JOINT Secretary,

Board of Revenue.

C.A. Henderson Esq., V.D., I.C.S., Commissioner of Land Revenue.

Read the following:

I.

Memorandum No.389 F/36-1, Revenue Dept., dated 3-2-1936.

II.

from Khan Bahadur Muhammad Humayun Saheb Bahadur, B.A., Collector of South Kanara, D.Dis.No.883-36, dated 6-6-36.

Sub: Forests -(South Kanara) - Unreserved lands - cutting of leaf manure - formation of panchayats - report -submitted.

Ref: Board's Rerce. L.No.212/36-1 dated 10-2-36.

The Tahsildars of Mangalore and Udipi taluks report that there are no compact unreserved blocks in their jurisdiction, for being handed over to village panchayats for the growth of forests. In a few villages, in the other four taluks of the district, there are large extents of unreserved land in the vicinity or reserved

forests. It has been reported that the undermentioned villages have compact blocks of non-kumaki and unreserved land.

Hosabettu)
Puchmogar) in Karkal taluk
and Todar)

Kaltod)
Yedthare) in Coondapoor taluk.
and Byndoor)

2. The ryots express two difficulties in taking up these blocks for the growth of forests. The first is payment of annual assessment if the lands are granted on patta. The second is the expenditure and trouble involved in raising and watching a forest for a period of five years. The first difficulty can be met by the grant of lands under B.S.O.19 which permits exemption from assessment for a period not exceeding 20 years where the object of the grant is the raising of private topes. All the panchayat forests in this district are exempt from payment of any lease amount. The second difficulty appears to be insurmountable, as ryots have shown marked inability to raise tangedu or other forest trees, even in panchayat forests which yield fairly satisfactory income. The ryots in the above mentioned villages of Coondapoor taluk want some portions of reserved forests to be given away to them under the system of forest panchayats, since they feel that they cannot raise a forest in unreserved lands. They seem to apprehend difficulty in finding labour to fence a big block of land and to watch it for a number of years without any income from the land during the time taken to raise a useful forest.

3. If Government desire that the scheme should be tried in some villages, I shall select blocks which are not likely to be required for cultivation and try to induce the ryots to do the needful.

Reference.

Submitted to the Government.

2. The Board understands that the proposal started

from observations of the amazingly rapid regeneration in enclosed areas in some places in the district. That the ryots cannot raise trees, etc., does not stand to reason; they do not want to raise timber but fodder and green leaf manure. It seems to the Board that in most places all they would have to do is to fence an area and leave it to itself for a year or two. But they have been impregnated with the idea that the Reserve Forest is the source of all their woes, and reasonableness, enterprise or energy in this matter is not to be expected of them. The Board therefore recommends that the Collector might be instructed to select the blocks as proposed by him and to try to induce the ryots to do the need-ful. The areas might be exempted from payment of any assessment if that will help.

3. The Board invites the attention of the Government (R) to their Order No.963, Press, Dev., dated 15-6-36 in which they sanctioned the continuance of the forest concessions in the district.

for Addl.Joint Secretary. 14/7

To The Secretary to the Government,
Revenue Department.

'RD/11-'7.

DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT.

Subject: Forests - South Kanara District - Formation of Panchayats.

" A copy of the minutes as now edited will be sent to the C.C.F. for necessary action and the necessary extracts to Revenue for the issue of instructions in respect of the formation of Panchayats to attend to the unreserves.

C. A. H.
20-1-36"

~~C. A. H.~~

Extracts from the notes recorded by H.M.Cl after his inspection of the forests in the South Kanara District are placed below. They may be sent to the Revenue Department for necessary action.

D.M.R.
24-1-36.

S. A. R.
25-1-36.

R. R.
25-1-36

Rev.

Dev.U.O.3156-I/35-5
25 - 1 - 36

ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO GOVT. 27 JAN 1936 REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Rev. Deptt.

Tows

A draft memo to the Bd is submitted for approval. Dev may see. Rev dept may also be requested to send up the original file for reference & ret

Per 389 F
~~Per 365 B~~
27-1-36

B2 27/1

Ilot Copy of 3W 29/1

Civ 1.2.36

Box N.2.

C3

1.2.36

1-2-36.

Issued as O.M. No. 389 F 36/1 dt 3.2.36
from the Bd of Rev. Ref. L No. 212-36-1
dt 10.7.1936

T.O.W.S.

Please see

(1) the memo to the Bd at pp 1-2 C.F.

and,

(2) the P.S.O's reply at pp 3-5 C.F.

It will be seen from para 2 of the Coll's letter at p 4 C.F. that the ryots are not keen on forming panchayats as suggested in the memo at pp 1-2 C.F. The Coll. states that if Govt. desire that the scheme should be tried in some villages, he will select blocks which are not likely to be required for cultivation & try to induce the ryots to do the needful. The Board also seems to be diffident about the keenness of the ryots. He however recommends that the Coll. may be instructed to select the blocks as proposed by him & to try to induce the ryots to do the needful & that the areas might be exempted from payment of any assessment if that will help.

3. If the scheme is to be tried at all, the lands should be exempted from payment of assessment. Otherwise, the ryots are not at all likely to take up the lands

for growing private forests. In Govt. 963 Rev Dy 15.6.26. the Govt sanctioned the continuance of the forest concessions in the district. Before the Collr's proposal which is supported by the Bd of Rev. is accepted. Dept. may be requested to say whether the scheme should be tried especially in view of their orders Dy 15.6.26. If the scheme should be tried, the file may also be sent to Finn for remarks on the question of exempting these lands from payment of assessment.

17/7
21/7

Please see also the remarks of H.M.C. (now H.E.) at A on p. 3 above. It seems clear the ryots are not going to co-operate & take up the scheme in earnest. The Collr's report shows that the ryots are definitely not keen & would prefer instead blocks of ready made forest growth! Portion B on p. 4 C.f. shows that the ryots do not take the idea of even merely enclosing plots of land & watching them. If lands are made over to the ryots free of assessm they would probably cultivate them

Why was this point overlooked? The extract from H.M's note shows that the idea intended to restore the concessions only for 5 years!

To A.S.

Please see the query above. The original minutes recorded by Hon. will be found at pp 57 to 65 of Go. No. 181 Dev. dy 6-2-1936. The ~~points are directed to be stated~~ whole question was subsequently discussed by Hon with the C-e-f. and the points on which the Forest Dept. should take action were communicated to the C-e-f. with the DO. at pp 67 of the Go. ibid. An extract of the instructions issued to the C-e-f. will be found at pps 12-16 of Govt. No. 607 Dev. dy 15-4-36. These extracts do not contain any reference to the point raised by the Secy. The instructions demi-officially issued to the C-e-f. and communicated by him to the Contr were subsequently issued as a Govt. adv in Go. No. 963 Dev. dy 18-6-36. As the original

(P) removed in Dev.

(P) removed in Dev.

W removed in Dev.

These were forwards by the C-e-f. to the contr with the remark that the removal of any leaf and dead fallen wood would be permitted - vide P. 12 of (S)

(S) removed in Dev.

(S) removed in Dev.

(orgl)

instructions issued to the C.C.F. did not refer to this point and they were issued as a result of the discussion of the matter by him with the C.C.F., this point was not referred to in the Go also. For ors whether the Go. No 963 Rev., Dy. 15-6-36 (Mf.) should be rescinded.

24/7/36. 26 & 836

The excision of the portion of H.M's minutes dealing with the formation of panchayats from the extracts sent to the Chief Conservator of Forests has led to the omission of any reference regarding the period for which the restored concessions would be operative. The Chief Conservator had already issued instructions for restoring indefinitely the concession regarding the removal of dry leaf and dead fallen wood, vide his D.O. of 28th April to the Government. On a close reading of H.M's notes it will seem that the formation of panchayats was a general question affecti not only the reserves in which the withdrawn concessio were partially restored, but all reserves where additi concessions given in 1922 are still being enjoyed. The

The position in South Kanara now is that in some reserves the concessions of 1922 are still in force, while in certain other reserves, from which the 1922 concessions were withdrawn for abuse of those concessions. only two concessions have been restored and it cannot be the intention that only in the latter class of reserves the concession should be in force for 5 years after the successful establishment of panchayats. The removal of the concessions contemplated by the H.M. will, I think, have to be applied to all the forests, if as a result of the enquiry remitted to the Rev. Dept. it is found feasible to organize panchayats as suggested by the H.M.

~~We have also restored only two Concessions~~. I agree that the ~~proposal~~ formation of panchayats need not be pursued in view of the reject.

CM.
8.8.36

Finance u/o

Fin (Accts) Dept

Revenue dept may agree with the Revenue and Development Secretaries

13.8.36

It was perhaps only to be expected

Geo. 329 & 1/36-1
1m a-36

page 7 ante

ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
10 AUG 1936
FINANCE DEPT.

22804 Accts

that, given a choice between

(1) continuance of concessions in reserved forests maintained by Govt., and

(2) development & maintenance of their own unreserved forests, accompanied by withdrawal of concessions in the reserved forests the villagers would elect for the former. The only stimulus likely to be effective in making them adopt the second alternative would seem to be an unequivocal statement that, in those areas where such a course could be taken by the villagers if they would, existing concessions would be withdrawn after 5 yrs whether the panchayat forests had been raised or not.

In the circumstances, & in particular in view of the orders issued in G.O. 963 d. 15.6.36, (R) I agree that every necessary to pursue the present proposal.

R.F. 1/7/36

R 3485F

15 8 36

17

15.7.36

ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO GOVT. 17 JUL 1936

Rev.

R.D.

Fwd no 22804 Rev(3)

15/8/36.

Tows

A draft order is put up for approval.

28/8

28/8

5

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL.

	Date.	Initials.
When received for fair copying ..		
When copied ..		
When examined..		
When signed ..		
When despatched.		

SUBJECT

READ AGAIN G.O. Nº 963 Dev, dated 15-6-1936 (R) ~~19~~.

" " ——— " ——— 19——.

READ *ALSO*:—

C. No. 389 F/36 From the Bd of Rev. ~~Report~~ No. 389 F/36 dated 3-2-1936. Hd-2-F

" ——— From —"— Regr " 212-36-1 " 10-7-1936. Ms 5-F

" ——— " ——— " ——— " ——— 19——.

Order ~~Resolution~~ Ms. ~~Rout~~. No. 1887, dated 26.8.36 19——.

The Board of Rev. is informed that the Govt have decided not to pursue the suggestion ~~contained~~ mentioned in Memo. Nº 389 F 36-1 dt 3.2.1936.

Hd-2-F

Go

Bd of Rev. ✓

Copy to Dev (also)

Acc 19/8

19/8

28/8.

21.8.36

L

D

ials.

27.8